DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 953 CS 206 360

AUTHOR Rubin, Alan M.
TITLE The Interactions of Television Uses and Gratifications.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 25p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (64th, East Lansing, MI, August 8-11, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Behavioral Science Research; *Behavior Patterns; Habit Formation; Individual Characteristics; Information Seeking; *Motivation; *Need Gratification; Programing (Broadcast); *Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Media Use

ABSTRACT

Data from 464 adults were analyzed to provide a more heuristic paradigm for mass communication uses and gratifications research in a study of the interactive nature of television viewing motivations, viewing behavior, and attitude gratifications. Factor analysis located five principal television viewing motivations: passing time, information, entertainment, companionship, and escape. Canonical correlation analysis identified two viewer types. The first viewer type--the one who used television out of habit, to pass the time, and for entertainment--exhibited sizable levels of television viewing, affinity (the importance of television in the life of the respondent), and realism (how realistic the television portrayals were perceived to be). The second viewer type used television to seek information or to learn, but not for escape. This motivational pattern resulted in overall higher levels of television viewing, particularly of talk-interview, news, and game show programs. Multiple regression analyses indicated that motivational structures of television viewing were useful in explaining television viewing levels, affinity, and realism. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205953

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

T&M

THE INTERACTIONS OF TELEVISION USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

ALAN M. RUBIN

University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Kenosha, Wisconsin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan M. Rubin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Prepared for Presentation in the
Theory and Methodology Division at the
Association for Education in Journalism Convention
East Lansing, Michigan, August 1981

CS206360

THE INTERACTIONS OF TELEVISION USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

Research inquiries into the reasons why people use the mass media and the gratifications derived from various media use date back some forty years. In exploring the functions of the media and the intervening role of audience members' needs and expectations in mass communication behavior, earlier investigations formulated typologies of radio and newspaper media use. For example, Herzog (1940, 1944) posited four appeals of radio quiz programs--competitive, educational, self-rating, and sporting, and three radio serial listener gratifications--emotional release, wishful thinking, and advice. Mendelsohn (1964) identified six generalized functions of radio listening--companionship, bracketing the day, changing mood, counteracting loneliness or boredom, providing useful news and information, allowing vicarious participation in events, and aiding social interaction. Berelson (1949) noted four uses of the newspaper--for information and interpretation of public affairs, as a tool for daily living, for respite, for social prestige, and for social contact.

Contemporary studies have examined television viewing motivations and gratifications, producing typologies of television use and exploring the links between these uses and the individual's social condition and television viewing attitudes and behaviors. For example, McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) proposed a four category media-person interaction typology--diversion, personal relationships, personal identity, and surveillance. Greenberg (1974) determined seven child and adolescent television viewing motivations--habit, relaxation, companionship, passing time, learning, arousal, and escape. Adopting a similar methodology, Rubin (1977, 1979)

identified six child and adolescent television viewing motivations--learning, passing time-habit, companionship, escape, arousal, and relaxation--and Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) observed seven public television viewing gratifications--relaxation, learning about things, communication utility, forget, passing time, companionship, and entertainment.

Only within the past few years, then, has there been any systematic attempt in uses and gratifications research to conduct modified replications of studies, to refine methodology, to comparatively analyze the findings of separate investigations, to respond to the criticisms of the perspective, and to treat mass media use as an integrated communication and social phenomenon. Recent studies illustrate several of these points. For example, Eastman (1979) analyzed the multivariate interactions among television viewing functions and life attributes. Ostman and Jeffers (1980) examined the associations among television viewing motivations and the potential for life style traits and television attitudes to predict viewing motivations. Bantz and Haynes (1981) explored the differences between general-medium and specific-program television viewing motivations, and the comparability of research findings. Rubin (1981, in press) considered the question of viewing motivations scale validity and comparability of research results in uses and gratifications investigations, as well as the role of functional alternatives and the multivariate interactions among viewing motivations and viewing patterns in the use of a popular television program.

These latter investigations provide the departure point of the present inquiry. Until quite recently, mass communication uses and gratifications studies followed a path of explaining single variable relationships. In

other words, the various uses of television would be initially observed and measured, and then each use or motivation would be independently and separately related to other variables in the investigation. These studies have provided useful, heuristic knowledge concerning reasons why individuals use a mass medium of communication, sociodemographic and life style descriptors of various types of media users, and media behavior and attitude gratifications resulting from certain media uses.

The most recent research endeavors have established the need to explore the relationships among adult television viewing motivations and patterns. There is a need to further the line of heuristic development which recognizes that viewing motivations are not isolated, static traits, but rather, comprise a set of interactive needs and expectations. In brief, an individual can use television for several potentially interconnected television viewing gratifications. Viewing motivations function in concert with one another to produce certain patterns of mass media gratifications. This premise, which has been suggested in previous investigations (Rubin, 1981, in press), provides the basis for the research questions of this inquiry: (1) What are the salient patterns of interactions among television viewing motivations, behaviors, and attitudes for adult viewers? (2) What pattern of television viewing motivations can aid in the explanation of viewing behavior and attitude gratifications of adult viewers?

METHODS

The relationships among the viewing motivations and viewing patterns of an adult sample were examined by executing a secondary analysis on a

subsample of data. The original data were collected from a sample of 626 respondents in two midwestern communities in November 1978 (Rubin, 1981). That sample ranged in age from 4 to 89 years. The present subsample of 464 adults, ranging in age from 18 to 89 years, was systematically selected from the original sample. The sample selection process followed two distinct steps. First, inasmuch as the concern of the present analysis was with adult television use, below-18 year old respondents were excluded. Second, within certain over-represented age groups in the original sample (i.e., 18 through 24 year olds), several questionnaires were randomly eliminated. The mean age of the subsample was 33.3 years; the subsample was 50 percent male and 50 percent female. In addition to sociodemographic characteristics, the instrument consisted of two sections: television viewing motivations; and television viewing patterns (i.e., behaviors and attitudes).

Television Viewing Motivations

Respondents had indicated their levels of agreement with 30 statements of reasons for watching television across five response options, ranging from "exactly" to "not at all" like their own reasons for viewing television. Inasmuch as the present analysis is an assessment of general television use motivations, three of the original items, reflecting a desire to view certain program content, were omitted from the secondary analysis. Responses were coded so that a 5 reflected a salient motivation, while a 1 indicated a non-salient motivation. The statements, a priori categories, means, and standard deviations are depicted in Table 1.

(Table 1 about here)

Patterns of viewing motivations were determined by, first, intercorrelating the items in a 27 x 27 matrix, and second, conducting a principal factor analysis with iterations and oblique rotation. Oblique rotation was utilized recognizing that viewing motivations are interrelated. Whereas "orthogonality imposes independency on a structure," oblique analysis "rotates all factors in hyperspace with one another in search of the best hyperplanes describing a construct" (McCroskey & Young, 1979, p. 379). The factor solution, which identified six initial factors, explained 54.9 percent of the total variance. Through the application of both a scree test and often-employed (although somewhat liberal) criteria, eigenvalues of at least 1 and a minimum of three primary factor loadings of .40 or greater (and no secondary loadings with a value above .30 on any other factor), five of the factors were retained: Factor 1 (Pass Time-Habit)--had an eigenvalue of 6.66 and accounted for 49.7 percent of the common variance; Factor 2 (Information/Learning)--eigenvalue of 2.17, 16.2 percent of common variance; Factor 3 (Entertainment)--eigenvalue of 1.64, 12.2 percent of common variance; Factor 4 (Companionship)--eigenvalue of 1.22, 9.1 percent of common variance; and Factor 5 (Escape)--eigenvalue of 1.13, 8.4 percent of common variance. Factor scores were computed and employed in subsequent data analyses. The factor solution is summarized in Table 2.

(Table 2 about here)

Television Viewing Patterns

Two categories of viewing patterns were examined: television viewing behaviors (viewing levels and program preferences); and television attitudes (affinity and realism).

Viewing levels were estimated by averaging responses to two questions requesting previous weekday and usual weekday viewing levels. The use of this measure is supported in previous research (Rubin, 1979, 1981) and attempts to provide a more reliable estimate of viewing levels by controlling for potential deviations in atypical responses of single-item measures. The two questions had a correlation of .64 and a .78 internal reliability alpha coefficient. The measure, though, reflects only viewing estimates. The average estimate of weekday viewing by all respondents in the subsample was 2.56 hours.

Program preferences were located according to respondents' identifications of up to three programs they would attempt to watch whenever those programs were aired. Two independent coders had assigned the programs to one of ten categories: children's show, comedy, daytime serial, drama-adventure, game show, movie, news, sports, talk-interview, and variety-music. Inter-coder agreement on 97 percent of the placements was obtained (Scott, 1955). Inasmuch as the children's show category contained fewer than 1 percent of the total mentions, it was omitted from further analysis. The number of program mentions by respondents was summed to formulate nine separate program preference measures.

Two summated indexes were utilized to assess the attitudes of respondents toward the television medium and its content. The five-item affinity index measured the felt importance of television in the lives of the respondents: "I would rather watch TV than do anything else;" "I could easily do without television for several days;" "I would feel lost without television to watch;" "If the TV wasn't working, I would not miss it;" and "Watching TV is one of the most important things I do each day." The five-item realism

index measured how realistic the respondents perceived television portrayals to be: "Television presents things as they really are in life;" "If I see something on TV, I can't be sure it really is that way;" "Television lets me really see how other people live;" "TV does not show life as it really is;" and "Television lets me see what happens in other places as if I were really there." The polarity of the second and fourth affinity and realism statements was subsequently reversed.

The items of the two attitude indexes were coded so that a 5 reflected an extremely positive attitude, while a 1 indicated an extremely negative attitude. Through the application of coefficient alpha in assessing scale reliability, the first affinity item and the second and fifth realism items were omitted from the respective indexes. The four-item affinity index had an inter-item correlation of .44 and a .75 internal reliability alpha coefficient. The three-item realism index had an inter-item correlation of .45 and a .71 internal reliability alpha coefficient. The mean affinity and realism scores for the subsample were 2.06 and 2.27, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

Following from the factor analysis procedures, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to assess the bivariate associations among viewing motivations. Inasmuch as these product-moment correlations indicated obvious viewing motivation interrelationships, canonical correlation analysis was employed to examine the multivariate associations among and between categories of viewing motivation and viewing pattern variables. Finally, multiple regression techniques were used to determine whether or not the viewing motivations could aid in the explanation of viewing levels and attitudes. Significance level was set at .001.

RESULTS

Viewing Motivation Interrelationships

The product-moment correlations among the several viewing motivations are summarized in Table 3. The use of the oblique rotation procedures in the factor analysis recognized the potential interrelatedness of television viewing motivations. This assumption is supported by the data in Table 3.

(Table 3 about here)

From these data, it is obvious that only information and pass time-habit viewing motivations are unrelated; all other viewing motivations are interrelated to some degree. Habitual-pass time viewing is associated with using television as a vehicle for companionship, escape, and entertainment. Information viewing is related to watching television for entertainment, companionship, and escape reasons. For the entertainment viewer, information, escape, pass time-habit, and companionship are additional viewing motivations. Companionship viewers are also watching television for pass time-habit, information, escape, and entertainment reasons. Escapist viewing might also be associated with using television to pass the time of day, for companionship, to acquire information, and to be entertained. The strongest of these viewing motivation correlations are between pass time-habit and both companionship and escape viewing.

Viewing Motivation and Viewing Pattern Interactions

The initial research question concerns the interactions among viewing motivations and viewing patterns. The application of canonical correlation analysis was necessitated in order to seek some coherent structure to the myriad of previously identified viewing motivation relationships. Table

4 summarizes the two significant roots which were located in this multivariate procedure. Interpretation of canonical roots typically focuses on coefficients of .30 or higher.

(Table 4 about here)

The first canonical root (R_c = .65) explains 42 percent of the variance. Set 1 depicts a positive relationship between entertainment and pass time-habit viewing motivations. Set 2 indicates positive associations among television affinity, viewing levels, and television realism. Redundancy coefficients point to one direction for interpretation across the two sets. Those individuals who are motivated to watch television to seek entertainment or amusement, while viewing out of habit to pass the time of day for boredom relief, reveal substantial affinity with the medium, watch considerable amounts of television, and perceive television content as being a rather realistic portrayal of life. Interestingly, this viewing pattern is unrelated to any preference for specific types of television programs.

The second canonical root (R_c = .45) explains 21 percent of the variance. Set 1 identifies a negative relationship between information and escape viewing motivations. Set 2 includes positive associations among talk-interview, news, and game show watching as well as television viewing levels. Redundancy coefficients, one again, support interpretation in one direction across the two sets. Those individuals who use television to seek information, but not to escape from or forget about life's problems, view talk-interview, news, and game show programming, and watch fairly high levels of television. Or, escapist, non-informational viewers would watch less television and not select information programs to view. There is also a slight indication that television affinity would be negatively

related, while perceived television realism would be positively related to informational, non-escapist viewing.

Viewing Motivations as Viewing Pattern Predictors

In light of the significant associations among viewing motivations and viewing patterns, the second research question concerns what structure of viewing motivations can aid in the explanation of television viewing levels, affinity, and realism. This final question further considers the consequences of television use by examining motivational contributors to three important television viewing patterns. The three multiple regression analyses are summarized in Table 5.

(Table 5 about here)

The three viewing behaviors and attitudes can be significantly explained by the viewing motivations. First, viewing levels increase with the salience of entertainment, pass time-habit, companionship, and information motivations, and decrease with the salience of the escape motivation. Second, television affinity also increases with the salience of entertainment, pass time-habit, companionship, and information motivations. Third, perceived television realism increases with the salience of information and entertainment motivations, in particular.

In sum, then, watching television in order to seek amusement or entertainment, as well as to pass the time of day when there's nothing better to do or to relieve boredom, would seem to indicate inflated television viewing levels and considerable felt importance of the role of television in one's life. Watching television in order to acquire information, as well as to seek entertainment or amusement, would seem to

indicate a heightened sense of the realism of television portrayals of life. Companionship motivations result in increased viewing levels of a somewhat highly regarded medium. Escapist viewing neither results in augmented affinity or realism perceptions, nor does it contribute to increased levels of television viewing; in fact, it would significantly contribute to decreased amounts of television viewing.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this secondary analysis was to progress beyond a single, isolated variable descriptive framework of television viewing motivations to a more meaningful and accurate explanation of television uses and gratifications. The viewing motivation factors identified in the present analysis compare quite favorably with earlier general television use investigations of children, adolescents, and adults. For example, pass time and habit viewing reasons also emerged on a single television use factor. The principal differences lie in the omission of arousal and relaxation structures from the oblique factor solution in the current study. However, these two factors have explained a relatively small percentage of the variance in the orthogonal factor solutions of some earlier reports (Greenberg, 1974; Rubin, 1977, 1979). In the present analysis the three relaxation items did load on a single, consistent factor, but that sixth factor explained only a small percentage of the total and common variance. The three arousal items did not emerge cleanly on any single factor, but instead, partially loaded on three different factors, including entertainment, escape, and information.

In contrast to previous investigations, though, the research questions of this inquiry sought to examine the interrelationships among viewing motivations for the explanation of television viewing behaviors and attitudes. The results of the several analyses support the initial supposition that television uses and viewing patterns are indeed interactive. In particular, the canonical correlation analysis described and the multiple regression analyses further explained two television viewer types.

The first viewer type uses television out of habit and to pass the time--when there is nothing better to do, to occupy idle time, and to relieve boredom--and for entertainment--because television viewing provides amusement and enjoyment. The gratifications or consequences for this television user lie in material amounts of generalized viewing of the television medium, and a heightened sense that television plays an important role in their lives and provides realistic portrayals of events. The original investigation (Rubin, 1981) also established strong, positive, bivariate associations between both pass time and entertainment viewing motivations and television affinity and viewing levels.

Of note here is a potential depiction of television addiction. Avid habitual and entertainment users of television view considerable amounts of a perceived realistic medium with which they feel a particular affinity, regardless of program content. In other words, the consequences of habitual-pass time, entertainment use of a communication medium, which is held in high regard, lie in sizable viewing levels with no obvious program preferences. It would be of interest for future investigations to further observe additional communication and social consequences of this television use model. For example, what are the pro- and anti-social cultural

consequences of watching large quantities of television to gratify habitual, entertainment needs? What role do functional alternatives, such as interpersonal communication, play in producing this viewing pattern, or, for example, how is interpersonal communication in the family or social group affected by this television use pattern? Are there certain personality, situational, or social environment conditions which lead to this pattern of viewing motivations and behaviors?

The multiple regression analyses further establish that habit-pass time and entertainment viewing motivations significantly contribute to substantial amounts of television viewing and to a felt affinity with the medium; the entertainment motivation also strongly contributes to a sense of realism in television content. To the contrary, the regression analyses also indicate that escapist viewing--or using the television medium to forget about personal problems and to get away from other people or tasks--results in reduced viewing levels, and does not contribute to a sense of television affinity or realism. This finding would provide a contrast to the univariate methodologies of earlier studies (Greenberg, 1974; Rubin, 1979, 1981) which observed significant positive relationships between an escapist viewing motivation and television affinity and viewing levels. The escape factor in the present analysis explained only a small percentage of the variance in the viewing motivation factor solution. Perhaps, then, escape--an often-mentioned function of television--is not actually a salient function of the medium, particularly when it is examined as one viewing motivation working in concert with other motivations for using television. Escapist viewing also appears to be a quite different motivation for using television than is using the medium as a habitual vehicle of

amusement for passing the time of day. Obvious television behavior and attitude differences between habitual-pass time and escapist television users were not clearly evident in those previous studies.

In addition, escapist viewing seems to provide a direct contrast to information viewing. This conclusion results from the multiple regression and canonical correlation analyses. Multiple regression indicates that using television to seek information provides a heightened sense of perceived realism of a rather heavily watched and somewhat important medium. These results support earlier findings (Greenberg, 1974; Rubin, 1979, 1981). The canonical correlation analysis also reveals this information-escape dichotomy in the second root.

The second viewer type uses television to seek information or to learn, and not for escape. This motivational pattern of use results in overall higher television viewing levels, and particularly, the watching of talk-interview, news, and game show programming. This model provides a contrast to the habitual entertainment motivational structure which found gratification in increased television watching, but not in specific program content. Therefore, the informational viewers are obviously not trying to escape from an information environment, but rather, are using television--and specific genres of informational programming--in order to learn about people, places, and events and to instrumentally use this information in interpersonal interaction (a social interaction item which loaded on the information factor). The social and cultural consequences of this information-seeking and avoidance dichotomy, the personality, situational, and social environmental conditions which are instrumental

in producing this viewing structure, and the complementary nature of mass and interpersonal communication channels for information seeking and gratification need to be further examined in subsequent research.

REFERENCES

Bantz, C. R., & Haynes, W. L. Exploring uses and gratifications: A comparison of reported uses of television and reported uses of favorite program type. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Minneapolis, 1981.

Berelson, B. What 'missing the newspaper' means. In P. F. Lazarsfeld & F. N. Stanton (Eds.), Communications research 1948-1949. New York: Harper, 1949, pp. 111-129.

Eastman, S. T. Uses of television viewing and consumer life styles: A multivariate analysis. Journal of Broadcasting, 1979, 23, 491-500.

Greenberg, B. S. Gratifications of television viewing and their correlates for British children. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratifications research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1974, pp. 71-92.

Herzog, H. Professor quiz: A gratification study. In P. F. Lazarsfeld, Radio and the printed page. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1940, pp. 64-93.

Herzog, H. What do we really know about daytime serial listeners? In P. F. Lazarsfeld & F. N. Stanton (Eds.), Radio research 1942-1943. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944, pp. 3-33.

McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. The use and abuse of factor analysis in communication research. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 375-382.

McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., & Brown, J. R. The television audience: A revised perspective. In D. McQuail (Ed.), Sociology of mass communications. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1972, pp. 135-165.

Mendelsohn, H. Listening to radio. In L. A. Dexter & D. M. White (Eds.), People, society and mass communication. New York: Free Press, 1964, pp. 239-249.

Ostman, R. E., & Jeffers, D. W. The relationship of life stage to motives for using television and the perceived reality of TV. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Acapulco, Mexico, 1980.

Palmgreen, P., & Rayburn, J. D. Uses and gratifications and exposure to public television. Communication Research, 1979, 6, 155-179.

Rubin, A. M. Television usage, attitudes and viewing behaviors of children and adolescents. Journal of Broadcasting, 1977, 21, 355-369.

Rubin, A. M. Television use by children and adolescents. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 109-120.

Rubin, A. M. An examination of television viewing motivations. Communication Research, 1981, 8, 141-165.

Rubin, A. M. A multivariate analysis of 60 Minutes viewing motivations. Journalism Quarterly, in press.

Scott, W. A. Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19, 321-325.

TABLE 1
Initial Viewing Motivation Sets

Initial Viewing Motivation Categories and Statements ("I Watch TV . . .")	Mean	Standard Deviation
RELAXATION		
1. Because it relaxes me	3.25	1.07
2. Because it allows me to unwind	2.89	1.17
3. Because it's a pleasant rest	2.90	1.04
COMPANIONSHIP		
1. So I won't have to be alone	1.97	1.17
2. When there's no one else to talk to or be with	2.45	1.25
3. Because it makes me feel less lonely	1.88	1.06
HABIT		
1. Just because it's there	2.38	1.25
2. Because I just like to watch	2.68	1.16
3. Because it's a habit, just something I do	2.33	1.27
PASS TIME		
1. When I have nothing better to do	2.89	1.30
2. Because it passes the time away, particularly when I'm bored	2.72	1.30
3. Because it gives me something to do to occupy my time	2.38	1.21
ENTERTAINMENT		
1. Because it entertains me	3.71	0.96
2. Because it's enjoyable	3.26	0.91
3. Because it amuses me	3.02	0.99
SOCIAL INTERACTION		
1. Because it's something to do when friends come over	1.59	0.87
2. So I can talk with other people about what's on	2.06	1.07
3. So I can be with other members of the family or friends who are watching	2.39	1.14
INFORMATION		
1. Because it helps me learn things about myself and others	2.71	1.16
2. So I can learn how to do things which I haven't done before	2.09	1.08
3. So I could learn about what could happen to me	2.10	1.06

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Initial Viewing Motivation Categories and Statements ("I Watch TV . . .")	Mean	Standard Deviation
AROUSAL		
1. Because it's thrilling	2.09	0.94
2. Because it's exciting	2.29	1.00
3. Because it peps me up	1.89	0.96
ESCAPE		
1. So I can forget about school or other things .	2.41	1.27
2. So I can get away from the rest of the family or others	1.64	0.92
3. So I can get away from what I'm doing	2.22	1.20

Note: Response options ranged from "exactly" (5) to "not at all" (1) like their own reasons for watching television. Category statements were alternately presented to the respondents. in other words, an escape statement followed an arousal statement, which followed an information statement, and so on.

TABLE 2
Oblique Rotated Factor Matrix of Viewing Motivations

Viewing Motivation Items	Viewing Motivation Factors				
	Pass Time-Habit	Inform	Entertain	Companion	Escape
Pass Time (1)	.69	-.07	.00	.03	-.02
Habit (1)	.66	-.04	-.07	.03	.03
Pass Time (2)	.62	-.13	.06	.24	.07
Pass Time (3)	.62	-.01	.01	.22	.10
Habit (3)	.60	.11	.07	-.01	.02
Information (2)	.04	.80	-.06	-.08	-.01
Information (3)	-.11	.67	-.04	.08	.18
Information (1)	-.11	.66	.07	.05	-.14
Social Interaction (2)	.10	.43	.01	.11	.00
Entertainment (2) . . .	-.01	.06	.71	.00	-.09
Entertainment (1) . . .	.01	-.09	.64	.01	-.06
Entertainment (3) . . .	-.02	.00	.57	.05	.14
Companionship (1) . . .	-.07	-.01	.01	.90	-.07
Companionship (3) . . .	.07	.08	-.01	.79	.03
Companionship (2) . . .	.25	.05	.01	.61	.00
Escape (2)	.06	.07	-.05	.07	.54
Escape (3)	.13	-.01	-.08	.06	.53
Escape (1)	.05	-.08	-.06	.03	.51
Relaxation (1)	-.07	.01	.06	.08	-.05
Relaxation (2)	-.05	-.07	.01	.09	.17
Relaxation (3)	.11	.09	.21	-.05	-.04
Social Interaction (1)	.10	-.02	.11	.00	.37
Social Interaction (3)	.21	.09	-.02	-.01	.19
Habit (2)	.39	.09	.43	.00	-.08
Arousal (1)	-.04	.14	.44	.04	.46
Arousal (2)	.01	.11	.48	.11	.41
Arousal (3)	.06	.31	.08	.00	.40
Eigenvalue . . .	6.66	2.17	1.64	1.22	1.13
Common Variance %	49.7	16.2	12.2	9.1	8.4

Note: The factor solution explained 54.9 percent of the total variance. A sixth factor in the unrotated solution had an eigenvalue of 0.58 and accounted for 4.3 percent of the common variance. Item identifications and numbers in parentheses refer to the initial viewing motivation statements and categories in Table 1.

TABLE 3
Viewing Motivation Correlation Matrix

	Pass Time-Habit	Inform	Entertain	Companion	Escape
Pass Time-Habit	---				
Information	.08	---			
Entertainment	.27	.32	---		
Companionship	.57	.32	.24	---	
Escape	.49	.32	.31	.32	---

$r = .10$, $p < .05$; $r = .12$, $p < .01$; $r = .15$, $p < .001$ (2-tailed)

TABLE 4
Viewing Pattern Canonical Correlates of Viewing Motivations

	Root 1	Root 2
Canonical Correlation . . .	.65	.45
Eigenvalue	.42	.21
Bartlett's Chi-Square . . .	414.63	167.58
Degrees of Freedom	60	44
Significance	p<.001	p<.001
Set 1: Viewing Motivations		
Entertainment	.54	-.10
Pass Time-Habit	.42	-.05
Information	.26	.88
Escape	.00	-.79
Companionship	.22	.09
Redundancy Coefficients . .	.05	.06
Set 2: Viewing Patterns		
TV Affinity	.49	-.27
TV Realism	.36	.24
TV Viewing Levels	.39	.34
Talk-Interview Program Viewing . .	-.10	.52
News Program Viewing	-.21	.41
Game Show Viewing	.01	.35
Drama-Adventure Program Viewing .	.12	.09
Sports Program Viewing	.10	-.19
Movie Viewing	-.08	-.02
Comedy Program Viewing	.04	-.22
Variety-Music Program Viewing . .	-.04	.08
Daytime Serial Program Viewing . .	-.01	.04
Redundancy Coefficients . .	.02	.02

TABLE 5
Multiple Regression: Viewing Motivations as Predictors of Viewing Levels, TV Affinity, and TV Realism

Viewing Motivations	Viewing Levels		TV Affinity		TV Realism	
	b	F	b	F	b	F
Pass Time-Habit	.22***	15.06	.21***	13.91	.09*	2.52
Information	.16***	12.20	.11***	5.44	.29***	34.78
Entertainment	.26***	35.35	.29***	44.80	.20***	17.99
Companionship	.19***	13.07	.14***	6.92	-.01	0.01
Escape	-.22***	19.16	.00	0.00	.01	0.02
	F = 31.12		F = 34.91		F = 20.72	
	df = 5/458		df = 5/458		df = 5/458	
	Mult. R = .50***		Mult. R = .53***		Mult. R = .43***	
	R^2 = .25		R^2 = .28		R^2 = .18	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001